

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are submitted in response to the Office Action dated April 24, 2009 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. However, the Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 14-1437.

Specification

The specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Specifically, it was asserted that Claim 32 recites the term "computer-readable storage", and this term does not appear in the specification, and thus it is unclear as to what the term "computer-readable storage" embodies.

It is noted that the term "computer-readable storage" is a commonly-accepted and often-used term to describe a category of claims, just as do the terms "method" and "device," which do not require an explicit definition in the specification.

In order to facilitate prosecution, the term "computer-readable storage" has been changed to "computer-readable medium," which is used by the MPEP (see, e.g., MPEP 2106.01 I).

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 2, 24, 33, and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claims 2 and 24 have been cancelled. Appropriate amendment has been made to Claims 33-34.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 22-25, 27-28, 30-33, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Published Patent Application 2008/0098353 to Hambleton, *et al.* (hereinafter Hambleton) in view of U.S. Published Patent Application

2002/0059288 to Yagi, *et al.* (hereinafter Yagi). Claims 4 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hambleton in view of Yagi, and further in view of U.S. Published Patent Application 2005/0251748 to Gusmorino, *et al.* (hereinafter Gusmorino). Claims 7, 29, and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hambleton in view of Yagi, and further in view of U.S. Published Patent Application 2004/0056903 to Sakai (hereinafter Sakai).

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections and thus have not amended the claims to overcome the art rejections.

Aspects of Applicants' Invention

It may be helpful to reiterate certain aspects of Applicants' invention prior to addressing the cited references. One embodiment of the invention, as typified by Claim 1, is a computer-implemented method of arranging grammar files in a presentation list in a callflow development graphical user interface (GUI) of a graphical callflow development system.

The method can include storing the grammar files in a computer memory; receiving a request to visually display in the GUI the grammar files in the presentation list; retrieving the grammar files from the computer memory; distinguishing between a first subset of files that contain user-defined grammars, each defining a grammar file written by a user, and a second subset of files that contain built-in grammars, each defining a system built-in grammar file; sorting the grammar files based on a first criterion that always assigns the first subset of files priority over the second subset of files; sorting grammar files within the first subset of files and grammar files within the second subset of files according to a second criterion; simultaneously displaying the first subset of files and the second subset of files within the presentation list such that the grammar files in the first subset of files are presented ahead of the grammar files in the second subset of files; and partitioning the first subset of files and the second subset of files by a visual aid.

The Claims Define Over The Prior Art

It was stated in the Office Action that Hambleton does not teach sorting the grammar files based on a first criterion that always assigns the first subset of files priority over the second subset of files; simultaneously displaying the first subset of files and the second subset of files within the presentation list such that the grammar files in the first subset of files are presented ahead of the grammar files in the second subset of files; and partitioning the first subset of files and the second subset of files by a visual aid. However, it was asserted that Yagi shows these limitations in Figs. 4(B), 6, 9(B), and 11.

Fig. 4(B) of Yagi shows a display item setting screen 44 used by the user to select files and folders to be displayed and the order of display. FIG. 6 shows a screen displayed by the file menu control section. FIG. 9(B) shows a screen displayed by the folder tree screen control section. FIG. 11 shows a screen displayed by the file/icon menu control section.

First, it is noted that in contrast to Yagi, in the present invention all grammar files are automatically displayed in a predetermined order and the user does not select the files to be displayed or the order of display.

Second, in Yagi the pre-specified files refer to files selected or specified by the user using the display item setting screen 44 (the section below "Specify files to be displayed") as shown in Fig. 4(B). The pre-specified files can be any files selected or specified by the user for display and are not necessarily built-in files. Similarly, the recently accessed files refer to any files recently accessed by the user and are not necessarily user-defined files (written by a user). "Application" and "Data" refer to the types of files and do not indicate whether the files are user-defined files or built-in files. Both user-defined files and built-in files could be application or data files.

Third, it was asserted in the Office Action that according to the figures of Yagi, the recently accessed files are always presented ahead of the pre-specified files (i.e. see

Figs. 6, 9(B), and 11). However, it is noted that in Fig. 12 of Yagi the pre-specified applications are presented ahead of other files or folders.

Accordingly, the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of Claims 1, 23, and 32. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claims 1, 23, and 32 define over the prior art. Furthermore, as each of the remaining claims depends from Claims 1, 23, or 32 while reciting additional features, Applicants further respectfully submit that the remaining claims likewise define over the prior art.

Applicants thus respectfully request that the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 24, 2009

/Gregory A. Nelson/
Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Yonghong Chen, Registration No. 56,150
NOVAK DRUCE + QUIGG LLP
Customer No. 40987
525 Okeechobee Blvd., 15th Floor
West Palm Beach, FL 33401
Telephone: (561) 838-5229